

Cumulative Table of Cases

Connecticut Appellate Reports

Volume 180

ARC Capital, LLC v. Asia Pacific Ltd.	38
<i>Enforcement of foreign judgment; motion to dismiss; subject matter jurisdiction; whether trial court properly concluded that foreign judgment obtained by plaintiff awarding it attorney's fees and litigation costs arising out of prior litigation with defendants could only be enforced through chapter 15 of United States Bankruptcy Code; whether chapter 15 applied when trial court gave preclusive effect to factual findings from otherwise unrelated foreign liquidation proceeding.</i>	
Artiaco v. Commissioner of Correction.	243
<i>Habeas corpus; claim that trial counsel provided ineffective assistance; reviewability of claims that habeas court erred in concluding that petitioner was not denied effective assistance of trial counsel and denying petition for certification to appeal; failure to brief claims adequately.</i>	
Beale v. Martins (See Rutter v. Janis)	1
Carvalhos Masonry, LLC v. S&L Variety Contractors, LLC.	237
<i>Contracts; whether trial court should have disqualified itself from adjudicating issues of liability and damages after it recommended posttrial that parties stipulate to judgment in amount of damages that plaintiff sought in proposed amended complaint.</i>	
Davidson v. Bridgeport	18
<i>Right to privacy; negligent infliction of emotional distress; intentional infliction of emotional distress; claim that trial court improperly found that defendants did not violate plaintiff's right to privacy; whether trial court's findings were supported by record; whether former police chief had authority to refer plaintiff for psychiatric independent medical examination due to concern for plaintiff's well-being; whether plaintiff presented credible evidence that defendants had improper intent to invade plaintiff's privacy; whether alleged intrusion into plaintiff's seclusion was unreasonable; whether reasonable person would have found alleged intrusion highly offensive; whether plaintiff failed to carry burden to prove that defendants invaded privacy; whether trial court properly concluded that defendants did not negligently or intentionally cause plaintiff emotional distress; whether record contained evidence that defendants intended to inflict emotional distress on plaintiff or that emotional distress was likely result of sending plaintiff for psychiatric examination; whether record contained evidence that by requiring plaintiff to undergo psychiatric examination defendants created unreasonable risk of emotional distress that resulted in illness or bodily harm.</i>	
Dinunzio v. Dinunzio	64
<i>Dissolution of marriage; whether trial court erred in treating plaintiff's military pension as source of income rather than as property subject to equitable distribution; claim that trial court properly treated plaintiff's pension as source of income because it was in pay status; whether vested pension benefits constitute property.</i>	
Ferreira v. Martins (See Rutter v. Janis)	1
Gilchrist v. Commissioner of Correction	56
<i>Habeas corpus; whether habeas court properly dismissed petition for writ of habeas corpus; whether habeas court lacked subject matter jurisdiction over habeas petition; whether petitioner alleged sufficient facts to establish that he was in custody on conviction he challenged at time he filed habeas petition; whether habeas court was obligated pursuant to applicable rule of practice (§ 23-29 [1]) to grant hearing to petitioner prior to dismissing habeas petition.</i>	
House v. Jones (Memorandum Decision).	901
In re Kyllan V.	132
<i>Termination of parental rights; collateral estoppel; whether trial court properly determined that adjudicatory ground for termination of parental rights had been fully and fairly litigated in prior petition to terminate respondent father's parental rights in child's sibling; whether trial court properly applied doctrine of collateral estoppel in determining that petitioner had proven adjudicatory ground by clear and convincing evidence; claim that petitioner failed to demonstrate that, as result of parental acts of commission or omission, child had been denied care,</i>	

<i>guidance or control necessary for child's well-being; whether adjudicatory ground was proven without resort to collateral estoppel.</i>	
Rutter v. Janis	1
<i>Personal injury; whether trial court properly granted motions for summary judgment; claim that trial court erred in concluding that there were no genuine issues of material fact regarding thirty day period to be applied pursuant to statute (§ 14-60 [a]) that permits car dealer to loan dealer number plate to purchaser of vehicle for period of not more than thirty days while registration of new vehicle is pending; whether trial court erred in computing thirty day period pursuant to § 14-60 (a); whether trial court erred in concluding that there were no genuine issues of material fact that defendant failed to comply with requirements of § 14-60 (a).</i>	
State v. Daniel W.	76
<i>Sexual assault in first degree; risk of injury to child; attempt to commit sexual assault in first degree; sexual assault in fourth degree; conspiracy to commit risk of injury to child; attempt to commit risk of injury to child; whether trial court abused its discretion in admitting certain uncharged sexual misconduct evidence to prove that defendant had propensity to sexually assault young girls; whether defendant's initial advances toward minor victim and uncharged misconduct witness were sufficiently similar; claim that minor victim and uncharged misconduct witness were not similarly situated; claim that uncharged misconduct evidence was unduly prejudicial because it allowed jury to conclude that defendant had propensity to sexually assault young girls; reviewability of unpreserved claim that certain testimony of social worker exceeded bounds of permissible constancy of accusation evidence; whether trial court abused its discretion in determining that social worker was qualified to render expert opinion as to delayed disclosure by and common behaviors of child sexual abuse victims; claim that prosecutor committed improprieties during trial and closing argument that deprived defendant of fair trial.</i>	
State v. Lima	48
<i>Conspiracy to commit larceny in sixth degree; whether trial court abused its discretion denying motion to vacate plea when at no time during plea canvass did court inquire as to whether defendant understood potential immigration consequences of guilty plea and instead simply advised that conviction could result in removal or deportation from United States; claim that trial court improperly failed to determine whether defendant understood immigration consequences of plea as required by statute (§ 54-1j); claim that trial court substantially complied with § 54-1j where defendant, when entering guilty plea, expressed absolute satisfaction with attorney's representation.</i>	
State v. Moore	116
<i>Possession of narcotics in violation of statute (§ 21a-279 [a]); whether amendment to § 21a-279 (a) that changed possible sentence of imprisonment of up to seven years for first offense to misdemeanor punishable by not more than one year of incarceration, which went into effect after date of offense but before conviction and sentencing, applied retroactively; whether trial court abused its discretion in denying motion to correct illegal sentence; whether legislature intended for amendment to statute to apply retroactively; whether prospective only application of amendment to statute was consistent with precedent and legislature's enactment of savings statutes; whether defendant's sentence was disproportionate and excessive in violation of the state and federal constitutions; reviewability of state constitutional claim where defendant failed to provide independent analysis of state constitutional claim pursuant to factors set out in State v. Geisler (222 Conn. 672); whether Geisler factors controlled defendant's state constitutional claim.</i>	
State v. Smith	181
<i>Sexual assault in fourth degree; risk of injury to child; sexual assault in first degree; sexual assault in second degree; claim that defendant's constitutional right to remain silent under Doyle v. Ohio (426 U.S. 610) was violated when state introduced evidence of defendant's post-Miranda silence; whether trial court's admission of challenged evidence was harmless beyond a reasonable doubt; whether challenged evidence was related to defendant's exculpatory theories advanced at trial; whether, apart from challenged evidence related to defendant's post-Miranda silence, state established guilt of defendant beyond reasonable doubt.</i>	
State v. Soyini	205
<i>Murder as accessory; conspiracy to commit murder; whether evidence was sufficient to show that defendant had intent to commit murder as accessory and conspiracy</i>	

to commit murder; whether evidence was sufficient to show that agreement existed between defendant and accomplice to cause death of victim and that defendant had intent to cause death of victim; whether jury reasonably could have inferred that defendant knowingly and wilfully assisted accomplice in acts that prepared for and facilitated victim's murder; unpreserved claim that trial court violated defendant's right to fair trial when it failed to instruct jury that it could not use accomplice's previous guilty plea to find that crime of murder had been proven beyond reasonable doubt; unpreserved claim that trial court committed plain error by giving jury unwarranted special credibility instruction on accomplice testimony.

<i>Zilkha v. Zilkha</i>	143
<i>Dissolution of marriage; child custody and visitation; claim that trial court abandoned its obligation to decide matter before it and improperly delegated its statutory authority regarding custody and visitation by granting children considerable level of control over extent of defendant's access to them; whether trial court improperly relied on events that occurred between 2004 and 2007 in reaching its decision to deny motions for modification of custody and visitation; claim that trial court improperly considered and adopted recommendations made by children's guardian ad litem because guardian ad litem chose to function as attorney for minor children instead of fulfilling obligations as guardian ad litem; whether, in reaching its decision, trial court improperly relied on erroneous factual finding; whether record supported relief ordered by court.</i>	